

FOURTH DAY—11th October 1927.

The House re-assembled at 12 noon.

Before the proceedings commenced, MR. P. SEETHARAMIAH invited the attention of the President to an adjournment motion of which notice had been given by some members. He said that this related to a matter of urgent importance, *viz.*, certain irregularities in the Eye Department of the Krishnarajendra Hospital, Mysore, resulting in the loss of eye-sight in a large number of cases. He requested that the adjournment motion be allowed and members permitted to discuss the question.

THE DEWAN observed that there did not appear to be any need to move the adjournment motion and that Government were quite prepared to explain the position then and there.

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT in the Development Department explained that the Eye Section of the hospital referred to was under the charge of a specially trained officer. But, from about the middle of July for about two or three weeks that officer was laid up with pneumonia and his work was attended to by trained Sub-Assistant Surgeons. As it happened, work was particularly heavy in this section during the period, as many as 800 cases coming up for attention. Out of this number only 35 patients suffered from gonorrhoeal ophthalmia. The eye-sight of one of them was lost, in two or three cases the vision was slightly reduced and all the rest were completely cured. It was true that some patients went to Bangalore for treatment but that was because the Eye Specialist at Mysore was down with pneumonia. In the opinion of Government, the reports published in some of the papers were certainly exaggerated.

MR. HOSAKOPPA KRISHNA RAO observed that a certain letter addressed by the Medical Officer in charge of the Bangalore hospital to the Editor, Viswakarnata, gave the impression that all the patients who attended that hospital were those that could not be cured in the Mysore hospital and that all these got relief in Bangalore.

THE DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY replied that if that was the impression created by that letter, it was not correct.

MR. HOSAKOPPA KRISHNA RAO took great objection to any and every person administering medicine to patients in the absence of the officer specially in charge of the same. He observed that if the doctor in charge was on leave, the hospital authorities should have made arrangements for posting another qualified officer to do the work during his absence or should have sent the patients to Bangalore for treatment at Government cost in view of the importance of eye-sight. It might be that some persons did not go to Bangalore, because they could not afford the expense.

THE DEWAN replied that this was hardly possible for Government to undertake to do.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that the Mysore hospital, till recently, had no Eye Specialist at all and that it was not possible to find another specialist to be in charge when the permanent doctor was on leave.

THE SENIOR SURGEON said that it was not possible in the earlier stages to make out whether a particular patient was suffering from ordinary sore-eyes or from gonorrhoeal ophthalmia. There were some cases under treatment and all these were cases of infection caught outside the hospital. He invited any member of the Assembly to visit the hospital and satisfy himself about it by studying the history of each case.

MR. M. VENKATAKRISHNAIYA said that as a non-official visitor of the hospital, he knew the details of the working of the Mysore hospital. The doctor in charge was very able, but as he was down with pneumonia, the member himself advised some of the patients to go to Bangalore for treatment. The whole difficulty was that the staff and equipment of the hospital were not sufficient. When only 22 beds were available, there were 40 in-patients actually and 20 or 30 more still awaiting admission. Even in the Out-patient Wards, there was much over-crowding. It was desirable to give at least one additional L.M.P. to the hospital and get him trained. He knew at least one case in which even gonorrhoeal ophthalmia was successfully treated in this very hospital. He therefore thought that there was nothing to justify any suspicion in regard to the happenings in the hospital.

MR. H. C. DASAPPA said that it was far from the intention of the members to create any alarm about this matter. He suggested that if Government really wanted to continue the Eye Department at Mysore, every possible

requirements ought to be provided for, otherwise, there was no use running it at all.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that this matter was receiving the earnest consideration of Government and that some additional hands had already been sanctioned.

MR. M. C. LINGE GOWDA said that the members were quite satisfied with the replies given by Government.

MR. HOSAKOPPA KRISHNA RAO, MR. M. S. DYAVE GOWDA and MR. C. SUBBANNA NAIK (Koppa Taluk); and MR. K. T. SATHYANARAYANA SETTY (Kadur Taluk).—

Q.—17. Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(1) Whether the attention of Government has been drawn to the articles of Mr. S. S. Setlur ending with his latest appearing in the "Hindu" dated the 18th July 1927, regarding the amelioration of the conditions of the Railway employees transferred from the services of the M. and S. M. Railway Company?

(2) Whether the increase sanctioned in 1920 in the pay, etc., of the transferred staff fulfils the conditions imposed on the Government by the M. and S. M. Railway Authorities in regard to the future prospects of the employees (for instance, the continuity of their previous service and the relative rank which depended on such service, prior to their transfer from the service of the Company and accepted by Mr. Dani, the then Officer-in-charge of Mysore Railways); if it does not, what further action do the Mysore Government intend to take in the matter?

(3) Whether they will be pleased to lay on the table the correspondence between Mr. Dani or any other officer acting on behalf of Government and the M. and S. M. Railway Authorities, which led to the transfer of these employees?

(4) How many of the transferred staff have since been superseded by directly recruited officials?

(5) (a) Have any representations been made by the aggrieved officials or the transferred staff as a whole? (b) If so, when? on how many occasions? (c) In what manner and with what effect?

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, RAILWAY DEPARTMENT.—

A.—17. (1) Government have perused the "Hindu" of 18th July 1927 but there is no article by Mr. Setlur on the subject.